

Serial No. 09/676,251  
Conf. No.: 3371

- 2 -

Art Unit: 1771

Keiser discloses a composite sheet material which includes an extruded microcellular foam sheet and a number of other components. In contrast, independent claims 1, 24, and 28 are directed to an in-molded decorated article that includes an injection-molded polymeric material and a substrate. One of ordinary skill in the art immediately recognizes the difference between the claimed injection-molded polymeric material component and the extruded microcellular foam sheet component disclosed in Keiser. The term "injection-molded" refers to distinct *structural* characteristics that makes the component easily identifiable as being injection-molded, and easily distinguishable from other components that are not injection-molded (i.e., an extruded sheet component). These structural characteristics may include a gate feature formed on the component at the injection location of polymeric material into the mold, a parting line feature formed on the component that indicates flashing of polymeric material between the parting line of the mold halves, and non-planar shapes, amongst others. Because Keiser fails to teach or suggest an in-molded decorated article that includes the claimed injection-molded polymeric material and substrate, independent claims 1, 24, and 28 are neither anticipated by, or obvious over Keiser.

Claims 2-3, 5-7, 12, 13, and 20-23 depend from claim 1; claims 25 and 27 depend from claim 24; and, claim 29 depends from claim 28. These dependent claims, thus, are patentable over Keiser for at least this reason. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the claim rejections on this ground.

Rejection of Claims 4, 9-11, 14-16, 17-19, 26, and 30-33

Claims 4, 9-11, 14-16, 17-19, 26, and 30-33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Keiser.

Claims 4, 9-11, 14-16, and 17-19 depend from claim 1 which is patentable over Keiser as described above. Claim 26 depends from claim 24 which is patentable over Keiser as described above. Claim 30 depends from claim 28 which is patentable over Keiser as described above. Therefore, these dependent claims are patentable over Keiser for at least the reason described above.

Applicants do not observe where Keiser discloses or suggests an in-mold decorated article comprising an injection-molded polymeric material as recited in independent claim 31.

621800.1

Serial No. 09/676,251  
Conf. No.: 3371

- 3 -

Art Unit: 1771

Keiser discloses a composite sheet material which includes an extruded microcellular foam sheet. As noted above, the term "injection-molded" refers to distinct *structural* characteristics that makes the component easily identifiable as being injection-molded, and easily distinguishable from other components that are not injection-molded including the extruded microcellular foam sheet of Keiser. Because Keiser fails to teach or suggest an in-molded decorated article that includes the claimed injection-molded polymeric material and substrate, independent claim 31 is patentable over Keiser.

Claims 32 and 33 depend from claim 31 and are patentable over Keiser for at least this reason. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the claim rejections on this ground.

#### Rejection of Claim 5

Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Keiser in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,961,983 (Smorada). Claim 5 depends from claim 1 which is patentable over Keiser as described above. Smorada fails to provide the deficiency of Keiser with respect to independent claim 1. Specifically, Smorada does not disclose an in-molded decorated article comprising an injection-molded microcellular polymeric material as recited in claim 1. Therefore, claim 5 is patentable over the combination of Keiser and Smorada. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 5 on this ground.

#### Claim 8

The Office Action does not address the patentability of claim 8. Claim 8 depends from claim 1 which is patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons described above. Therefore, claim 8 is also patentable over the cited references.

#### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this

621800.1

Jun 9 2002 19:10 P.04

Serial No. 09/676,251  
Conf. No.: 3371

- 4 -

Art Unit: 1771


response, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Respectfully submitted

*Vadala et al., Applicants*

By:



Robert H. Walat, Reg. No. 46,324  
Timothy J. Oyer, Reg. No. 36,628  
Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C.  
600 Atlantic Avenue  
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2211  
Tel. No.: (617) 720-3500  
Attorney for Applicant

Docket No. T0428/7090  
Date: June 10, 2002  
X06/08/02 (Saturday)

621800.1